

# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

## 2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT FOR:

**Boys and Girls Club of Indianapolis**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
<b>Tutor Qualifications</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Lesson matches original description</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>	<b>Criminal Background Checks</b>	<i>In Compliance</i>
<b>Recruiting Materials</b>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<b>Instruction is clear</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>	<b>Health/safety laws &amp; regulations</b>	<i>In Compliance</i>
<b>Academic Program</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Time on task is appropriate</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>	<b>Financial viability</b>	<i>In Compliance</i>
<b>Progress Reporting</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>		
<b>Assessment and Individual Program Design</b>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<b>Student/instructor ratio: 6-1:1</b>	2 <i>Approaching Standards</i>		

*As of the 2008-2009 school year, Boys and Girls Club of Indianapolis will no longer be providing SES programs to Indiana students.*

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Boys & Girls Club of Indianapolis  
**REVIEWER:** S.T.

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** February 28, 2008

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<b>BOTH</b> of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications ( <u>all tutors</u> ) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Tutor evaluations ( <u>all tutors</u> ) -Recruiting policy for tutors ( <u>one copy</u> ) -Sample tutor contract ( <u>one copy</u> )	-Tutor applications and resumes -Tutor agreement -Copy of orientation training packet	<b>X</b>		-Based on resumes/applications submitted, tutors meet tutor qualifications described in provider's application amendment; -Tutor agreement is in line with provider's application; -Provider's application states that tutors will receive professional development training in the following areas: Project Learning Training, Effective Guidance & Discipline Techniques, Principles of Youth Development training, ongoing in-services, training from regional and national conferences, Tri-State Professional Organization Training and joint McCoy & After school Coalition trainings. However, beyond the initial orientation, only one tutor received additional professional development training that was described in the provider's application.
Recruiting materials	<b>TWO</b> of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	-Incentive policy -Recruitment brochures		<b>X</b>	-Recruitment brochures provide an overview of the tutoring program that is in line with provider's original application; -Provider's Incentive Policy is in line with state's Incentive Policy.
Academic Program	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	-Lesson plans -Connections to Indiana Academic Standards -Connection to district program	<b>X</b>		-Lesson plans provided (as well as those reviewed during observation) do not have clear lesson goals/objectives or include "high-yield learning activities" (as described in the application) that would be implemented during the lessons. For instance, goals are listed as "work on reading comprehension" which describes the activity to be completed during session but is not a clear objective (i.e. student will be able to demonstrate improved reading comprehension skills by correctly responding to at least 8 out of 10 questions on quiz at the end of tutoring session, etc.). In addition, the session activities described in the lessons primarily state that students will complete worksheets and do not include details regarding engaging learning activities or instructional strategies that will be utilized during the session (see "Lesson matches original description in provider application" section in onsite monitoring area of report); -Lessons connect to Indiana academic standards and district programming (for the most part).

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Progress Reporting	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports)</li> <li>-Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>-Documentation of reports sent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Progress reports</li> <li>-Documentation of reports sent</li> <li>-Progress report timeline</li> <li>-SES Contracts and Agreements</li> </ul>	X		<p>-According to one school district, progress reports are not submitted in accordance to the timeframe agreed to in the SES Contract;</p> <p>-Progress reports include information regarding the subject areas for tutoring, student strengths and areas in need of improvement, student’s grade level equivalency upon entering and leaving the program, and a tutor rating regarding how well the student is progressing on academic achievement. However, the progress reports list a checklist of academic standards as goals for each student while the SES Agreement states student goals as improving by 10% on assessments in reading and math. In addition, the reports do not indicate <i>specific</i> information regarding how the student is improving in his/her academic achievement. The tutor’s rating (i.e. Extremely Significant, Very Significant, Significant, Not Very Significant, and Not at All Significant) of the student’s progress is very general and does not indicate any specific information about the concept or subject area (i.e. math, reading comprehension, etc.) in which the student is making progress. It is also unclear how the student’s progress toward achievement levels is assessed as no ongoing assessment scores or information that would allow for the tutor to rate student improvement is included in the report. Lastly, the academic standards targeted on several students’ progress reports are not consistent with the standards identified on SES Agreements. For instance, some students have standards selected on their progress report that were not identified in their SES Agreement as focus areas or students have standards that were identified on their SES Agreement but these standards were not identified on their progress reports as areas of focus. Therefore, it was difficult to assess whether students were appropriately working on areas that were identified in their Student Learning Plans or whether they were inappropriately working on areas that were not originally targeted in their Individual Plans (see “Lesson matches original description in provider application” section in onsite monitoring area of report).</p>
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider’s pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of learning plan development process</li> <li>-Pre-assessment scores, SES Agreements/Student Learning Plans, and Learning goal forms</li> <li>-Explanation and examples of assessment’s connection to Indiana academic</li> </ul>	X		<p>-Description of development of Individual Learning Plans appropriately includes the use of pre-test results to identify skill gaps. However, it is the provider’s responsibility not each student’s role to develop: learning goals, individualized plans, resources that will be used during lessons, and identify the measures that will be used to determine whether students achieved their goals (the description submitted states that students complete learning goal forms and develop responses to each of these items). In addition, the learning goal forms include goals that are not measurable and list worksheets as resources to assist students without describing the high yield learning activities or any of the other programming that was detailed in the application;</p> <p>-Explanation of assessment’s connection to Indiana Academic Standards demonstrates pre and post-test correlation to standards.</p>

		standards			
--	--	-----------	--	--	--

**On-site Monitoring Rubric  
OBSERVATION Components**

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Boys & Girls Club of Indianapolis  
**SITE:** Emma Donnan Middle School; Crispus Attucks Magnet School  
**TUTOR’S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):** A.D.; K.D.  
**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED:** 2

**DATE:** February 6, 2008; February 19, 2008  
**REVIEWER:** S.T. & K.C.; S.T. & M.C.  
**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:15 p.m.; 4:05 p.m.

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving “1 or 2 points” on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
-----------	------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------

Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			<p>-At one site, students worked independently on worksheets. The tutor only interacted with students if/when they had questions. At another site, a student worked with a tutor on math homework that focused on decimals, percents, and fractions;</p> <p>-Observed tutoring sessions were somewhat in line with description in provider application. For instance, at one site a student was observed working on homework as described in application. However, at another site where students worked independently on worksheets, tutoring materials did not appear to be based on any pre-set programming or curriculum designed to target individual student needs. For instance, when asked how lessons were developed for students, the tutor shared he/she selects worksheets once the session begins and then shared a binder with previous lesson plans. It was not evident that the lessons connected to individual student needs identified by provider’s pre-test. For example, one student’s learning plan indicated he/she should focus only on Language Arts lessons based on his/her pre-test scores. However, all of the lesson plans (up to the day of the observation) for this student focused on math rather than being tailored to recognize the individual student’s needs. Lastly, at one site, the tutor did not provide instruction (see “Instruction is clear” section below) as the tutor only interacted with students if/when students had questions. In addition, the lesson plans reviewed during the observation did not have clear objectives, introduce concepts to be learned by students, provide a framework for tutors to follow, or share instructional strategies or “high-yield learning activities” (as described in the application) that would be used to assist students in learning concepts. For instance, the lesson plan for one student stated his/her goal was to work on the distributive property. While this shares what the student would work on during the lesson, it is not a clear objective. In addition, the materials and strategy listed on the plan to facilitate the student’s work on this goal was that the student would complete a worksheet. A review of multiple lesson plans for this student and others indicated similar patterns (i.e. the goal was listed as “working on a concept” and the activity was listed as a worksheet). However, working on worksheets with no instruction, little interaction with the tutor, and no clear connection to larger academic concepts is not in line with the description of “high-yield learning activities” and “engaging homework help and tutoring” that were described in provider’s application.</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Instruction is clear		X			<p>-At one site the tutor answered questions when students asked for assistance but did not provide any instruction or directed guidance on the concepts or standards addressed in the worksheets. When students were not asking for assistance, the tutor either sat quietly or talked to other staff members who worked with the provider's non-SES program hosted in the same room. Students at this site were not always aware of what they should work on when they were finished with their worksheets or when they were waiting for tutor assistance;</p> <p>-At another site, the tutor provided more directed assistance to the student by reviewing the math concepts with the student from his/her textbook that were necessary for him/her to answer homework questions. The tutor also asked the student to explain why he/she selected answers in an effort to ensure the student truly understood the concepts involved in the homework assignment. The student appeared to understand what was expected of him/her and what tasks he/she was to complete during the tutoring session.</p>
Time on task is appropriate		X			<p>-At one site, although the provider's application describes how the provider will "create an atmosphere that is conducive to learning", the learning environment was very disruptive and loud which made it challenging for students to remain on task. There were over 25 students in the tutoring room that were not a part of the provider's SES program but were a part of the provider's other after school program. The noise level from the other students made it very difficult for students to hear each other and often led to the students being distracted and off task. For example, occasionally one of the students would leave the tutor to talk to other students not involved in the SES program or other students not involved in the SES program would join the SES students during their tutoring session to socialize briefly. When this happened, the students were not redirected and the tutor did not attempt to utilize strategies to promote time on task;</p> <p>-At another site, the student was on task and engaged in completing homework with his/her tutor. The tutor did not need to redirect the student at any point during the session.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			<p>-At one site, the tutor appeared to be familiar with the concepts covered in the worksheets but did not utilize instructional strategies or learning activities to provide tutoring/instruction to students or help students connect their work on the worksheets to standards or larger academic concepts. In addition, although the tutor shared student binders with lesson plans, it was clear lessons were not developed ahead of time and the tutor indicated that he/she picks lessons at will on the tutoring day rather than using a plan based on individual student needs identified by pre-test scores. Lastly, this tutor did not incorporate practices to engage students in their lessons and promote time on task;</p> <p>-At another site, the tutor had a good rapport with the student and had a clear understanding of the student's needs based on the pre-test scores and parent feedback. The tutor implemented appropriate correction techniques to ensure the student had a clear understanding of concepts and utilized multiple instructional methods.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 6-1:1		X			The observed ratio at one site was not in line with provider's application. The ratio reported in original provider application is listed as 3:1. However, the ratio observed at one site was 6:1.





# **On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric** **COMPLIANCE Components**

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Boys & Girls Club of Indianapolis  
**REVIEWER:** S.T.

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** February 28, 2008

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	<b>ALL</b> of the following:  -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	-Criminal background checks	<b>X</b>	
Health and safety laws and regulations	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Student release policy(ies)  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	-Student release policy -Emergency policy	<b>X</b>	
Financial viability	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	-Audited financial statement -Tax returns for last 2 years -Verification of liability insurance coverage	<b>X</b>	